

IN PARLIAMENT
HOUSE OF COMMONS
SESSION 2005-06

CROSSRAIL BILL

PETITION

Against – on Merits – Praying to be heard by Counsel, &c.

To the Honourable the Commons of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland in Parliament assembled.

THE HUMBLE PETITION of CHRISTOPHER ROY SANDERS BROWN
SHEWETH as follows:-

1. A Bill (hereinafter referred to as “the Bill) has been introduced and is now pending in your honourable house intituled “A BILL TO Make provision for a railway transport system running from Maidenhead, in the County of Berkshire, and Heathrow Airport, in the London Borough of Hillingdon, through central London to Shenfield, in the County of Essex, and Abbey Wood, in the London Borough of Greenwich; and for connected purposes.
2. The Bill is presented by Mr Secretary Darling, supported by The Prime Minister, Mr Chancellor of the Exchequer, Secretary Margaret Beckett, Mr Secretary Hain, Secretary Alan Johnson, Secretary Tessa Jowell and Derek Twigg. The railway transport system described in the Bill is hereinafter referred to as “Crossrail” All parties responsible for the planning and promotion of Crossrail and the provisions of the Bill are hereinafter referred to as the “the Promoters”.
3. Clauses 1 to 20 set out the Bill’s objectives in relation to the construction and operation of Crossrail. They include provision for compulsory acquisition, planning permission, heritage issues, trees and noise. Clauses 21 to 44 of the Bill establish a regulatory regime for Crossrail and Clauses 45 to 59 of the Bill deal with miscellaneous and general provisions. Schedules 1 to 14 of the Bill largely deal in detail with the interaction of the Bill with existing legislation.

Your Petitioner objects to the wording of the Long Title of the Bill which makes reference to Crossrail “running.....through central London to Shenfield , in the

County of Essex” and the reference in Clause 1 (1) (b) to “works for the construction of other railways inthe Borough of Brentwood in the County of Essex”.

4 Your Petitioner further objects to Clause 6 and Schedule 6, specifically to the works in the Borough of Brentwood listed in Schedule 6, page 101, lines 25 to 35.

5 Your Petitioner is:-

Christopher Roy Sanders Brown of 43 Friars Avenue, Shenfield, Essex. who is, together with his wife, owner of the property at this address. This property is a four bedroom detached house in which your Petitioner, his wife and, from time to time, two adult children live. The property is approximately fifty years old and has been your Petitioner’s family home for 23 years.

6 Your Petitioner and his rights, interests and property are injuriously affected by the Bill, to which your Petitioner objects for reasons, amongst others, hereinafter appearing. Your Petitioner will look to the Promoters for commensurate compensation for all injuries should the Bill pass into law in its present form.

7 Your Petitioner’s house is located on a road where house and garden are backed by proposed construction works and planned future operation of Crossrail.

8 The medium term effects of implementation of the Bill in its present form are likely to be:-

5 A i Reduction of property value, caused by planning blight, during an, as yet undefined, period of planning and execution of the works which some reports indicate will extend long beyond that indicated by the Promoters. There appears to be considerable doubt on the financing of Crossrail. In addition to this, your Petitioner is in possession of a cutting from the September 2005 Edition of “The Railway” specialist magazine in which an article by the editor entitled “London’s rail network to receive massive upgrade as Great Britain gains Olympics” states in relation to Crossrail that, in creating too much simultaneous demand on the resources of the construction industry, “it is possible that it may now have to be placed on the back-burner until after 2012”. These uncertainties suggest that the possibility of the construction of Crossrail will cause blight for well over a decade. Your Petitioner notes the provision of Sub-clause 11 (1) of the Bill that “the carrying out of a scheduled work” must be begun within 10 years of the Bill being enacted. The provision of Sub-clause 11 (2) of the Bill, enabling the Secretary of State to extend the period defined in Sub-clause 11 (1) means, in effect, that the period of planning blight associated with Crossrail is unlimited.

3D ii

Considerable disruption and disturbance through noise, vibration and other side effects during the performance of the works. The Environmental Statement deposited with the Bill predicts such adverse effects, including acknowledgement of the possibility of the need for temporary rehousing and sound insulation. Your Petitioner will be so affected.

1C ii

3K vi

5B iii

The negative impact of the works on the residential area in which your Petitioner lives is likely because of, inter alia, loss of car parks and heavy road traffic, to be considerable. As well as disruption to daily life this could prejudice the survival of businesses in Hutton Road, a valuable shopping street that is of much benefit to your Petitioner. Such disruption and potential loss is shared by your Petitioner and other residents of and visitors to Shenfield.

9 Longer term effects of the implementation of the Bill are likely to be:-

3J ii

Loss of amenity and, consequently, value in your Petitioner's house and, more particularly, garden as a result of noise and other disturbance, caused by the operation of Crossrail. This will result from significantly enlarged train sidings commensurate with a cross London "tube" system at the end of your Petitioner's garden together with increased and locally unnecessary train traffic. Your Petitioner is in possession of a letter addressed to him as a "Resident" dated 22 July 2005 from Mr. R McLintock, Chief Executive and Town Clerk of Brentwood Borough Council which states, inter alia, that "Applications can be made for council tax reductionsas and when the full project implications are known and dates confirmed".

1B iv

Loss of visual amenity in Shenfield as predicted in their Environmental Statement by the Promoters

10 Your Petitioner humbly submits that none of the above injuries should be caused to rights, interests and property because no useful public purpose is served by terminating Crossrail at Shenfield in the east. The public interest would be better served by terminating Crossrail at Stratford, or such other place on the eastern edge of the main conurbation of London as might conveniently serve the principal objective of the Promoters, for reasons enumerated below:-

1J ii

The principal purpose of Crossrail is to provide a new rail link across central London, essentially between Stratford in the east and Paddington in the west. Documents produced by the Promoters indicate no significant increase in rail traffic between Shenfield and east London (Environmental Statement Vol. 3 10.20.47) whilst indicating that most of the traffic will

be carried between Whitechapel, Bond Street and Paddington
(Environmental Statement – Non Technical Summary Page 9)

Your Petitioner notes claims by the Promoters that Crossrail will help to rejuvenate parts of east London. This may be true for the section between Whitechapel and Abbey Wood south of the Thames. It might have been true for an extension on the north of the Thames through such places as Barking, Dagenham, Rainham and Grays that currently have poor rail service. The communities on the proposed route using existing track between Stratford and Shenfield have, subject to constraints herein mentioned which Crossrail will aggravate, a good rail service and no need of such rejuvenation. The Promoters intend to bring Crossrail to Shenfield simply for somewhere to end it. Residents of Shenfield and other areas along the proposed route will suffer considerable disruption and loss without compensating benefits.

There will be no transport benefits to users of Shenfield railway station, be they local residents or others taking advantage of its train service. There is already a train service from Shenfield to Stratford and Liverpool Street that, interruption permitting, is fast and frequent. Journey times between these stations are approximately 20-25 minutes. This service must continue because Shenfield is at the junction of main lines running between London and Southend on the Thames estuary and to Chelmsford and East Anglia beyond. Train passengers from Shenfield to London will continue to use the fast services that have been largely overlooked by the Promoters in claimed savings in journey times as a result of Crossrail that will stop at all intermediate stations between Shenfield and Stratford/Liverpool Street.

There will be no transport benefit to users of intermediate stations between Shenfield and Stratford/Liverpool Street. A "Metro" train service that runs six trains an hour from Shenfield to Stratford/Liverpool Street stopping at all intermediate stations already exists. The Promoters apparently propose to run twelve trains an hour in the same rail corridor on existing track also stopping at all intermediate stations, except Maryland. Those who use the "all stations" service to or from intermediate stations between Shenfield and Stratford/Liverpool Street will gain no benefit from an extension of Crossrail to Shenfield. Your Petitioner and other users of these and associated services are familiar with frequent service interruptions resulting from problems with track, signals, trains and other causes. An attempt to run twice as many trains on the existing slow corridor is likely to result in the railway equivalent of a traffic jam of near empty trains between Shenfield and Stratford to the benefit of nobody.

The existing track between Shenfield and Stratford carries both fast Intercity services and freight. The likely damage to both the fast services and important freight traffic, resulting from overloading of the slow corridor, was highlighted by your Petitioner's MP, Mr Eric Pickles, in the debate on Second Reading of the Bill on 19 July 2005.

- 11 The Promoters organised presentations of their plans to residents of the Brentwood area in October 2004 and February 2005. As a result of these presentations your Petitioner is in possession of two engineering drawings, called, to the best of your Petitioner's belief, Safeguarding Drawings, that show the proposed impact of Crossrail on Shenfield. The first drawing is referenced 110600-E1G00-P00-P-50232 A. It is called Sheet 232 and dated October 2003. The second drawing has a similar reference with the initial number replaced with 110400 and the final letter with D. It is similarly called Sheet 232 and is dated February 2005. The drawing from October 2003 shows very little impact on Shenfield, such being limited to two new train "stabling" lines to the east of the station that would, probably, have caused little disruption during construction or operation. The drawing from February 2005 shows considerable extension of both eastern and western sidings, construction of a new platform at Shenfield station and the taking over of car parks for performance of the works. The preparation of these drawings is separated by a period of approximately 16 months. The Promoter's project has been in gestation for many years. Your Petitioner regards these changes in the proposed impact on Shenfield in a relatively short time as a matter requiring further investigation. It is difficult to avoid the conclusion that the Promoters were concentrating on their principal objective of building a line under central London and paying little heed to where it might end. Mr Pickles in the debate mentioned above quoted their spokesman as saying, in effect, that Crossrail would end at Shenfield because that is "where railways end". Such an approach would seem to ignore the rationale for so doing.
- 12 Your Petitioner would like to make a further point that supports the argument that the proposed Crossrail is, essentially, an upgraded "tube" system under central London and is not intended to carry passengers any great distance. In response to a question from your Petitioner, Jonathan Baggs, Area Consultation Manager (East) representing the Promoters, in a letter of 15 July 2005 states that "It is not currently anticipated that Crossrail trains would have toilets on board". Your petitioner would humbly suggest that this fact might not trouble those planning a quick trip from, say, Whitechapel to Paddington but might concern many people considering using significant portions of the outer sections of the proposed route.
- 13 Stratford is planned as a major rail communication interchange including linkage to Eurotunnel. Much substantial infrastructure exists and more could be built in an area of little residential impact. Should Crossrail not be continued into areas in south Essex where it might be useful, then it should be terminated at Stratford, or such other place as suggested herein, with provision of ready interchange between

AEI

Crossrail and existing services to Shenfield and beyond. Such a scheme would achieve the principal objective of the Promoters while avoiding unnecessary, collateral harm.

- 14 For the foregoing and connected reasons your Petitioner respectfully submits that, unless the Bill is amended as herein follows it should not be allowed to pass into law. The Long Title and Clause 1 (1) (b) should be amended to terminate Crossrail at Stratford or such other place on the eastern edge of the main conurbation of London as may conveniently satisfy the principal objective of the Bill. Such other changes, mutatis mutandis, should be made to Clauses and Schedules of the Bill as are necessary to give effect to these amendments.
- 15 There are other clauses and provisions of the Bill which, if passed into law as they now stand, will prejudicially affect your Petitioner and his rights, interests and property and for which no adequate provision is made to protect your Petitioner.

YOUR PETITIONER therefore humbly prays your Honourable House that the Bill may not be allowed to pas into law as it now stands and that he may be heard by himself, counsel, agents and witnesses in support of the allegations of this Petition against so much of the Bill as affects the property, rights and interests of your Petitioner and in support of such other clauses and provisions as may be necessary or expedient for their protection, or that such other relief may be given to your Petitioner in the premises as your Honourable House shall deem meet.

AND YOUR PETITIONER will ever pray, &c.